

1 COPIC? I'm sorry, separate CLEC outside plant
2 interconnection cabinet?

3 MR. ROUSEY: Again, the issues are pretty
4 much synonymous with those of the NID, and the
5 reason we put POT bays, et cetera, or one of the
6 reasons, in central offices is they are accessing
7 Verizon facilities directly, and you're saying our
8 technicians--

9 MR. REEL: This is the kind of example
10 where your techs do the work.

11 MR. ROUSEY: I guess our position is there
12 are numerous advantages to both companies, and that
13 the CLEC having the ability to run their own
14 cross-connect wires, et cetera, is not relying
15 necessarily on Verizon's technicians to do that
16 work.

17 MR. REEL: But if the CLEC decides that it
18 would prefer to have Verizon technicians do the
19 interconnection rather than put up its own COPIC
20 having to get its own right of way and whatnot,
21 would that work? Is that acceptable to Verizon?

22 MR. GANSERT: I think the other issue is

1 the issue of coordination and trying to coordinate
2 two different operations. With the COPIC there, we
3 could dispatch our craftsmen, they could get their
4 work done, they could verify completion, verify
5 they done it in a quality way, and then the
6 purchaser of the unbundled element could do the
7 same thing.

8 As soon as you start saying that we are
9 going to do cross-connection work for another
10 person, then you get into this whole very ambiguous
11 situation of who schedules things, who controls it,
12 how do you verify there was quality, who does the
13 testing?

14 It becomes problematic for operational
15 reasoning. It's hard for us to understand why
16 somebody wouldn't want the COPIC there because we
17 would go and say we did our job and we could tell
18 we did the thing right.

19 MR. REEL: Leaving that aside to the CLEC
20 interests, perhaps they have difficulty getting the
21 right of way, whatever the reason, is the most
22 severe problem the coordinating of having the techs

1 show up together?

2 MR. GANSERT: And meeting the quality and
3 the service--the service commitments that we make.

4 In other words, are you going to waive all
5 the rules and say, "We will get it done as best we
6 can," or are we going to--we are coming from the
7 experience of hot cuts, so having a complaint every
8 time we're not there every minute something--

9 MR. REEL: Are telling me that hot cuts
10 are not technically feasible?

11 MR. GANSERT: I'm not saying that.
12 Indeed, in hot cuts we have POT bays and
13 technically feasible points where we could manage
14 the process for that very reason. We are not
15 asking anything here that we haven't already proven
16 is operationally efficient and proper way to do it
17 in the unbundled loop environment. We are using
18 exactly the same logic in the procedures we
19 created, the operations we created, doing unbundled
20 loops. Why wouldn't we extend them logically to do
21 the subloops? Why would we create a different
22 operational framework that has all kinds of

1 problems there?

2 MR. REEL: I think we had enough on that
3 one.

4 Let me ask you, does Verizon typically own
5 its central offices?

6 MS. DETCH: That's probably a real estate
7 question.

8 MR. REEL: Just generally, would you say
9 Verizon owns its central offices? Owns or leases?

10 MR. GANSERT: We own or lease them
11 certainly.

12 MR. REEL: That would be also true of a
13 remote terminal?

14 MR. GANSERT: We don't own the property
15 they are on. We have the right of way to have the
16 apparatus there.

17 MR. REEL: You wouldn't own the vault or
18 the--

19 MR. GANSERT: We own the box but typically
20 not the property it's on.

21 MR. REEL: Would you own the telephone
22 room in an MTE, multitenant environment?

1 MR. GANSERT: No, definitely not. That's
2 private property.

3 MR. REEL: That would be the property of
4 the landlord?

5 MR. GANSERT: That's right.

6 MR. REEL: Thank you.

7 A couple of questions for WorldCom. In
8 your proposed contract language, 4.4.2.2, I think,
9 and then you talk about your loop feeder
10 requirements. I'm actually going to 4.4.2.3, the
11 loop feeder provided by Verizon. Must be capable
12 of transmitting analog voice frequency basic rate
13 ISDN, digital data, optical signals, or analog
14 radio frequency signals as appropriate.

15 Would that be as Verizon determines is
16 appropriate, or as WorldCom determines is
17 appropriate?

18 MR. LATHROP: I don't believe we thought
19 that there would be a difference. It would be that
20 the media should be capable of transmitting
21 whatever signals are appropriate to that so that
22 optical fiber should be capable of transmitting

1 optical signals so it's not the case that we obtain
2 something that is defective, essentially.

3 MR. REEL: So, when the intent of the
4 definitions of loop feeder from 4.4.1 and the
5 requirement of 4.4.2 and so on, the intent behind
6 this is that whatever feeder WorldCom gets is
7 comparable in quality and functionality to that
8 which Verizon provides itself, or is there
9 something more there?

10 MR. LATHROP: No, there is nothing more
11 there. It's just really that, I guess, comparable
12 to what Verizon provides itself that is not
13 defective.

14 MR. REEL: So, you don't have any kind
15 of--

16 MR. LATHROP: There is no intention of
17 obtaining anything superior to what Verizon
18 provides for itself.

19 MR. REEL: Would there be any construction
20 that Verizon would be--that you foresee this
21 contract language would subject Verizon to? I
22 think Verizon has interpreted it that way, and I

1 think it's understandable reading it why they might
2 think that. It looks like on the face as if
3 WorldCom might be saying, "Look, Verizon, we are
4 going to tell you the quality--the precise nature
5 and quality of the feeder that we are going to
6 get."

7 MR. LATHROP: That was not the intent to
8 have any quality difference that is probably not
9 governed by some standard setting body.

10 MR. REEL: I wonder if Verizon would like
11 to speak to that.

12 MR. ROUSEY: My statement would be that
13 you're correct in what you're assuming. That was
14 our viewpoint as well, that it seemed to be very
15 open-ended, that it would lock us in to providing
16 potential performance standards to services we may
17 not provide, updating facilities. Just a wide
18 gambit of open issues.

19 MR. STANLEY: John, if you could let Jerry
20 ask a question and then return to yours.

21 MR. STANSHINE: Real fast. Going briefly
22 back into that COPIC. I guess similar functions

1 provided by POT bay, point of termination bay, in
2 the central office, again a clean boundary between
3 CLEC and ILEC. Was there a POT bay?

4 MR. GANSERT: Yes.

5 MR. STANSHINE: Do have you to use POT
6 bays in all states where you have your cages or
7 states that don't require the POT bay?

8 MR. LATHROP: A POT bay is not technically
9 required. I believe most places we do use one just
10 for that point of termination clarity. And I guess
11 it would be important because there are situations
12 where, as you said, the ILECs technicians deal with
13 one side and CLECs deal with another side, and the
14 COPIC scenario I have spoken of earlier was that
15 Verizon's technicians could be the only ones there.

16 MR. STANSHINE: Okay. So, POT bay is used
17 in most places, is what you're saying?

18 MR. LATHROP: That's my understanding,
19 yes.

20 MR. STANSHINE: Who pays for it?

21 MR. LATHROP: It depends on how the
22 co-location costs and rates are developed most of

1 the time. I would say CLECs pay for the space
2 because most ILEC cost studies in costing out, say,
3 the space of a co-location cage include not just
4 the hundred square feet if that's a side of the
5 cage, but additional space around the cage, and I
6 guess in a virtual co-location arrangement there is
7 no POT bay equivalent, or there may not be as
8 frequently.

9 MR. STANSHINE: Admittedly, the POT bay
10 does provide cleaner boundaries in the
11 jurisdictions between ILEC and CLEC work.

12 One of the issues that determines whether
13 it's worthwhile is not just the benefit but the
14 cost. I was wondering if you think the COPIC
15 function will cost more out in the outside plant
16 than the POT bay function costs in the central
17 office?

18 MR. LATHROP: Well, yes, because--yes is
19 the answer. I don't know that's the question we
20 would face. I think we would want the flexibility
21 to, in some instances, if the COPIC is easier, we
22 would want to do that, but in some instances it may

1 not be, and so we want the flexibility to be able
2 to connect to the FDI.

3 MR. STANSHINE: When you say not easier,
4 you're talking about factors other than cost?

5 MR. LATHROP: No, things related to cost.
6 Time and cost of obtaining rights of way. It may
7 not cost that much to place a COPIC in any one
8 area, but the time required, or there may be
9 factors that relate to cost but may not--

10 MR. STANSHINE: They impact your overall
11 economics.

12 MR. LATHROP: Ability to serve customers.

13 MR. STANSHINE: Thank you.

14 MR. REEL: If I could follow up on my line
15 of questioning I had before, WorldCom, you said,
16 4.5.1 that upon MCIm's request, Verizon shall
17 provide MCIm copper twisted pair distribution even
18 in instances where the distribution for services
19 that Verizon offers is other than a copper
20 facility.

21 So, that seems to me to imply that you
22 expect a different kind of facility than what

1 Verizon was providing itself. Am I misreading it?

2 MR. LATHROP: No, you're not misreading
3 it.

4 MR. REEL: I ask you to look at 4.4.5,
5 where it says, (reading) In addition to
6 requirements set forth above, MCIm may designate
7 the loop feeder will transport DS3 and OCN.

8 That's another instance where it seemed to
9 me that it might be a different facility than the
10 facility that Verizon had in place.

11 MR. LATHROP: I could see how that could
12 be read that way. As I said yesterday, we would be
13 willing to talk to Verizon about this. If we were
14 willing to change this to read explicitly that we
15 do not expect Verizon to construct facilities for
16 us to obtain loop feeder.

17 MR. REEL: I guess I have one final
18 question of AT&T. I noticed that in Mr. Pfau's
19 testimony on page--I think it's on page 88, line
20 15--I'm sorry, I don't want to direct you there.
21 Sorry, that's not an important point, and we could
22 let that go in the interest of time.

1 Let me ask you about this: Also in
2 Mr. Pfau's testimony, AT&T praises the way that New
3 York handles access to telephone rooms. It says
4 that the New York Commission has rules that handle
5 access to telephone rooms and multitenant
6 environments that AT&T found appropriate.

7 MR. PFAU: I think basically the point was
8 that like--that the New York Commission explicitly
9 requires where the inside wire was owned by the
10 incumbent LEC that they permit the connecting CLEC
11 to have access to the room and move wiring from the
12 customer side of the interface device to their own
13 network.

14 MR. REEL: Whose network?

15 MR. PFAU: Interconnecting LEC's network.

16 MR. REEL: On to your own terminal or the
17 terminal--on Verizon's terminal?

18 MR. PFAU: It would be off Verizon's
19 terminal.

20 MR. REEL: Off the customer side of
21 Verizon's terminal on to--

22 MR. PFAU: Right. If you think of the

1 terminal as being in two pieces, you got one side
2 the outside plant terminates on and has grounding
3 functions and things like that. On the other side
4 there is another set of terminals which connects to
5 the inside wire, and there is a cross-connect
6 between the two.

7 MR. REEL: Okay.

8 MR. PFAU: What this is saying is you take
9 the cross-connect out and take the inside wire over
10 to a different set of connecting blocks and then
11 connect it to the CLEC's outside plant, which is
12 also grounded and--appropriately.

13 MR. REEL: Now, I think I understood
14 Verizon to say that that was exactly the kind of
15 interconnection that Verizon had no problem with
16 when the wire went from the customer side of the
17 terminal and was moved over to the CLEC's terminal.

18 MR. ROUSEY: I was unable to hear the
19 first part of that, and I apologize for that, but
20 what I'm hearing, and I will recap here is removing
21 the inside wire from the customer's side of a
22 Verizon NID, transitioning that over to the

1 customer's side of a CLEC-placed NID. And you're
2 correct with that, Verizon has no issues with CLECs
3 doing--performing that function.

4 MR. PFAU: I thought you objected when you
5 owned the inside wire. Are you saying that if you
6 owned or controlled the promise--

7 MR. GARY: Panel members, don't ask each
8 other questions.

9 MR. REEL: Okay. Let me put it this way,
10 and to go back, and it was yesterday, but
11 apparently in almost all situations in Virginia,
12 the Verizon network ends at the MPOE. The
13 exception to that is campuses mostly, and it's a
14 very small percentage of the multitenant
15 environments in Virginia.

16 MR. ROUSEY: Right. And the issue here, I
17 think, or what I'm hearing is New York is not an
18 MPOE state, so there is a uniqueness there with
19 what we are saying, and Mr. Pfau is correct in that
20 the campus-type environments where we talked about
21 CLECs going in and actually moving the wire that
22 Verizon owns and maintains, then it is similar to

1 the scenario that we are talking about, or
2 comparable to the scenario we are talking about in
3 New York. Verizon owns the inside wire house and
4 riser, et cetera, in New York.

5 MR. REEL: So, Verizon owns the house and
6 riser, it wants to do the moving?

7 MR. ROUSEY: Correct.

8 MR. REEL: Because it has--

9 MR. ROUSEY: Performance issues.

10 MR. REEL: Performance issues, billing
11 issues.

12 MR. ROUSEY: Tossing with--performance
13 issues comes up the potential for fines, I'm
14 assuming penalties, and then all of a sudden
15 Verizon is not even involved in this, but yet we
16 could be potential for--

17 MR. REEL: But the rest of the instances,
18 most instances in Virginia when it's at the MPOE
19 and it's the customers, once it's past the terminal
20 device, its landlord or customer-owned wire, there
21 Verizon has no issue with it being moved?

22 MR. ROUSEY: That's correct.

1 MR. REEL: Now, I take it that Verizon
2 makes available a stand-alone NID UNE if the CLEC
3 just wants to connect at Verizon's NID?

4 MR. ROUSEY: Yeah, you're correct with
5 that.

6 MR. REEL: And there Verizon would also do
7 the work, or Verizon would allow the CLEC to do the
8 work?

9 MR. ROUSEY: Did you say the State of New
10 York?

11 MR. REEL: No, in Virginia.

12 MR. ROUSEY: If there's a NID currently
13 available and in place--again, the same issues
14 there. In a stand-alone NID, the issue we
15 would--the only issue we would have with that is if
16 the CLEC wishes to lease that stand-alone NID and
17 there are already Verizon facilities terminating on
18 that NID that are not available, and the customer
19 would be disconnecting service from Verizon at that
20 point in time, we would want to go out there and be
21 the company responsible for removing our facilities
22 and placing the CLEC's facilities to that NID for

1 the purposes of the same issues we had before.

2 MR. REEL: And I see. What is AT&T's
3 position on that?

4 MR. PFAU: On the stand-alone NID?

5 MR. REEL: Yes.

6 MR. PFAU: I'm having trouble figuring out
7 what a stand-alone NID really is.

8 MR. REEL: Let's say it's the terminating
9 device where we are in a telephone room, we are in
10 a multitenant environment--in other words, a big
11 building with many tenants--and in this room there
12 is a terminal device where the network
13 interfaces--the network that Verizon owns
14 interfaces with the nonnetwork wire on the other
15 side; the landlord-owned house and riser, if you
16 will.

17 Now, there's extra space on this NID, and
18 AT&T purchases a stand-alone NID UNE, so they got
19 the UNE.

20 MR. PFAU: In that case it's where I tie
21 down the outside plant I'm bringing into the
22 building?

1 MR. ROUSEY: Could I toss in real quick?
2 Realistically, a stand-alone NID would be where the
3 riser facilities would be removable from that NID.
4 That's when we are talking about us
5 disconnecting--Verizon disconnecting the
6 facilities. At that point is when it becomes
7 really the stand-alone NID. We have none of our
8 network site facilities terminated issue that.

9 MR. PFAU: With that clarification, I
10 think a stand-alone NID is a concept only in theory
11 because if I'm going to take a facility out to a
12 premise, I probably have a fairly big facility, I'm
13 anticipating serving a lot of customers, so I'm
14 probably not going to be taking Verizon's cable off
15 of a terminal device and putting mine on.

16 And in the grand scheme of things, the
17 cost of me taking the facility out to a building is
18 huge, and the cost of a cross-connecting block is
19 very small. So, I think I would prefer to put my
20 own block down and tie my own cable on to it. And
21 it would be nice to have access too, but I don't
22 think we would ever use it.

1 MR. REEL: Is that acceptable to Verizon?

2 MR. ROUSEY: I agree with what he's saying
3 if I were in the same position.

4 That issue that comes with that, and with
5 Virginia being an MPOE state, we are talking about
6 AT&T, WorldCom or whatever simply at that point
7 transitioning the company inside wire over there to
8 the other sides of the NID, which we have no issues
9 with.

10 MR. DYGART: Is that it, John?

11 MR. REEL: Yes.

12 MR. KEHOE: I'm William Kehoe. I'm going
13 to be asking questions on issue IV-18, which
14 concerns multiplexing and concentrating equipment.

15 Before I get to them, I would like to
16 follow up just very, very briefly. Verizon, if I
17 understand your position on accessing dark fiber at
18 a remote terminal, the CLEC must co-locate there in
19 order to do that; is that correct?

20 MS. DETCH: Right. They would need a
21 virtual or physical co-location arrangement in an
22 adjacent structure.

1 MR. KEHOE: I would like to ask WorldCom
2 first, in other regions are you aware of any ILECs
3 that don't require co-location in order to access
4 fiber at remote terminals?

5 MR. LATHROP: We included--I'm not sure we
6 included language in the Bell South agreement that
7 we have, and I would think that it's generally the
8 case that co-location would be required, if not
9 used. But Bell South's language is broad enough, I
10 think, so we might be able to obtain their fiber
11 without co-location.

12 MR. KEHOE: AT&T, is your answer to that
13 question the same?

14 MR. NURSE: I don't believe that
15 co-location is necessary, if that was the question.

16 MR. KEHOE: Are you aware of any other
17 regions in which the ILEC permits access to dark
18 fiber at remote terminals without requiring
19 co-location?

20 MR. NURSE: I couldn't say.

21 MR. KEHOE: Thank you.

22 I would like to understand WorldCom's

1 position with regard to issue IV-18. The proposed
2 contract language would have the Commission
3 classify the loop concentrator multiplexor as an
4 unbundled network element. Are you still urging
5 that position?

6 MR. BUZAROTT: No, we are not taking that
7 position.

8 MR. KEHOE: Thank you.

9 MR. BUZAROTT: Our position is the
10 multiplexor is a function or feature of the loop
11 element or the transport element.

12 MR. KEHOE: Thank you.

13 I would like to ask Verizon, is the
14 essential characteristic of multiplexing that a
15 bandwidth is aggregated to a higher bit rate or
16 bandwidth or disaggregated to a lower bit rate or
17 bandwidth?

18 MR. GANSERT: Yeah. I think simply put,
19 multiplexing is adding together a number of lower
20 bit rate channels to form a higher bit rate channel
21 to transport on--normally on a higher capacity
22 facility. Or the reverse, as you mentioned.

1 MR. KEHOE: And the difference between
2 multiplexing and concentrating is, in
3 concentrating, you go from one number of channels
4 to a different number of channels.

5 MR. GANSERT: Yes, or it could even be one
6 number of bits to a number of different bits.
7 Channelized concentration, yes, is what you're
8 saying.

9 MR. STANLEY: Is that basically the same
10 definition for multiplexing, then, if you're
11 talking about the bit rates from a low bit rate to
12 a high bit rate? Is that the same as multiplexing?

13 MR. GANSERT: I was thinking more of a
14 packet type of concentration versus--in channel
15 concentration, you're getting basically rid of the
16 empty ones. In other forms of concentration you're
17 sort of managing--taking out the spare bits and
18 throwing them away, but they both have the same
19 effect, to have a more complete payload, get rid of
20 the unused part of the payload.

21 MR. KEHOE: For WorldCom, have you
22 prepared contract language that reflects your

1 position on this issue?

2 MR. BUZAROTT: No, I haven't. The issue
3 between WorldCom and Verizon has been whether
4 Verizon--excuse me--is obliged to provide
5 multiplexing to us as a feature of the loop or
6 transport element. So, we haven't even really
7 engaged the issue of how to define multiplexing.

8 MR. KEHOE: Is it an either/or proposition
9 if multiplexing is part of the loop? Is it
10 necessarily not part of transport?

11 MR. BUZAROTT: No. I think multiplexing
12 is a feature of the loop that can equally be a
13 feature of the transport element.

14 MR. KEHOE: Just to clarify, we are
15 talking about a multiplexor that would be located
16 in a central office.

17 MR. BUZAROTT: Primarily, yes.

18 MR. KEHOE: Where else would we be talking
19 about?

20 MR. BUZAROTT: There could also be
21 multiplexor of some type in a remote terminal. But
22 our primary requirement for multiplexing is to

1 concentrate lower capacity loops on to higher
2 capacity transport or to multiplex lower capacity
3 transport links on to higher capacity transport
4 links at a central office.

5 MR. KEHOE: Would you typically be
6 co-located where you wanted to do that?

7 MR. BUZAROTT: No, we would not. In some
8 cases we would be, but in the vast majority of
9 central offices, we do not have a co-location site.

10 MR. KEHOE: And--

11 MR. BUZAROTT: In those cases, we would
12 require that Verizon provide multiplexing as a
13 feature of the loop or transport element.

14 MR. KEHOE: With one, the multiplexor
15 would be located in the subloop, would that be part
16 of the subloop element, under your position?

17 MR. BUZAROTT: That's correct. It would
18 be a feature of subloop element.

19 MR. KEHOE: And not of transport?

20 MR. BUZAROTT: Right. In that scenario,
21 that would be a feature of the subloop element.

22 MR. KEHOE: Where physically within a

1 central office that fits that scenario would the
2 multiplexor be located?

3 And if I could state my understanding, a
4 loop would come into the central office--and
5 correct my understanding if I'm wrong--the loop
6 would come into the central office and terminate at
7 the main distribution frame, and what would happen
8 after that? How would it get to the multiplexor?

9 MR. BUZAROTT: I'm not precisely familiar
10 with how Verizon would arrange that in a central
11 office, but the scenario that we are considering is
12 a situation where we might have several customers
13 that we are serving over DS1 loops, for example,
14 and then we would request multiplexing to multiplex
15 those DS1s on to a DS3, which would then be
16 cross-connected into our co-location cage.

17 MR. KEHOE: I asked my last question to
18 the wrong party. I would ask you to trace how the
19 loop would proceed, if it goes to the main
20 distribution frame, where it would go next, just
21 from a technical standpoint.

22 MR. GANSERT: Of course, it depends on the

1 kind of loop, but if what normally appears on a
2 main distributing frame would be copper outside
3 plant, if it's a typical two-wire copper outside
4 plant, it would terminate on the outside plant side
5 of the main distributing frame and then be
6 cross-connected to whatever application you were
7 using it for. If it was a switched loop, it would
8 be connected on the main distributing frame to the
9 office equipment to the switch port termination, to
10 form essentially the switch platform, switch plus
11 loop.

12 If it's a DS1, that would normally come
13 in. In most cases--well, let's say it's on copper,
14 which is--maybe it's not the most forward way of
15 looking at it, but if it's on copper, it would
16 still come in to an outside plant frame and then be
17 terminated over to some--an electrical terminal to
18 terminate the DS1 signal. And from there, it
19 would--normally, the DS1 would be connected to a
20 cross-connection frame for DS1 signals and could be
21 connected to either interoffice facilities or
22 another outside plant facility or a switch even

1 potentially, I guess.

2 Not a switch. DS1 would only be an
3 on-switch service.

4 MR. KEHOE: Does the physical
5 configuration vary depending on whether you're
6 providing the tariff service you referenced in your
7 prior testimony and another service--and an EEL
8 might be another service?

9 MR. GANSERT: I think we are getting--we
10 are talking here about a DS1 special access service
11 that is going from a local central office and
12 connects to a high capacity system and is delivered
13 to some other point.

14 In that case, by some means it could be a
15 fiber base or copper. However it is done, the DS1
16 is delivered to the central office. It's connected
17 to usually a manual connection frame there, and
18 from there it enters into the transport--into the
19 transport infrastructure on a DS1 port that could
20 be on sonic multiplexor, it could be on a
21 cross-connection system, whatever in that
22 particular office, depending on what that size is,

1 is the entry point for DS1, and then it's
2 multiplexed up and aggregated onto a higher
3 capacity facility, delivered to the other ends,
4 wherever the special access terminates, and then it
5 would be demultiplexed and delivered at the DS1
6 connection.

7 If it's an EEL, my understanding is that
8 essentially it stays the same.

9 MR. KEHOE: Thank you.

10 MR. ROUSEY: I would like to touch on this
11 just quickly to make sure I understand what was
12 being said here from a subloop perspective. I
13 think I heard the position that if there were a
14 concentrator multiplexor in Verizon's loop, that
15 that would--that that's being viewed as a
16 stand-alone subloop element? Because that's the
17 way I interpret the contract language, to some
18 extent, in a lot of places.

19 MR. KEHOE: Is there a question here?

20 MR. ROUSEY: Well, I guess what I'm trying
21 to get at here is, from the contract language that
22 I have seen in here proposed in the WorldCom, I

1 believe it is, where they are talking about loop
2 concentrator and multiplexors in the loop, it
3 appears--my perspective on this is it appears to be
4 stand-alone unbundled network element, and my
5 concern with that is a stand-alone--

6 MR. KEHOE: If I could, I believe they
7 testified that that's not their position.

8 MR. ROUSEY: Okay.

9 MS. FARROBA: Bill, do you have any other
10 questions?

11 MR. STANLEY: Jerry, I know you have a
12 question.

13 MR. STANSHINE: Is it Verizon's view that
14 the multiplexing is a standalone UNE?

15 MR. ROUSEY: No, it is not, from a subloop
16 perspective, from what I heard Susan say, I believe
17 she agrees with that as well. That was my concern,
18 is the contract language implies that, so that's
19 why I wanted to address that.

20 MR. STANSHINE: What about if it's the
21 example the gentleman from WorldCom was giving,
22 where ot's multiple DS1 loops coming into the CO to

1 combine onto a DS3?

2 MS. FOX: It's our position that that
3 multiplexing used in that way is not a UNE.
4 Multiplexing is not a UNE, period.

5 MR. STANSHINE: Because it's not
6 transport?

7 MS. FOX: It's not identified as a UNE in
8 the UNE Remand Order. It's not on the list of UNEs
9 that was reaffirmed in that order.

10 MR. KEHOE: I have a couple more.
11 What's a digital cross-connect for
12 Verizon?

13 MR. GANSERT: What is a digital
14 cross-connect system?

15 MR. KEHOE: Yes, briefly.

16 MR. GANSERT: It's a fairly sophisticated
17 network element that, or network device, I get that
18 confused--semantics is killing us in this--it's a
19 very complicated network system that typically has
20 various--that has various types of digital ports on
21 it anywhere from DS1 up to DS3 or even higher,
22 depending on the type, and it provides the

1 connection of some fixed channel speed between
2 those ports, and that channel speed is what
3 determines what kind of DCS it is. So, for
4 example, a narrow band DCS, the speed of the switch
5 inside, the electronic cross-connect frame is DS0.
6 In fact, technologically it's like a local central
7 office, the type of switch matrix it has. It just
8 doesn't have the software capabilities of it. A
9 wide band frame connects DS1 channels between
10 ports, and a broad band cross-connect typically
11 connects DS3s between the ports.

12 MR. KEHOE: I have a question for
13 WorldCom.

14 Do you receive access to Verizon's digital
15 cross-connect in your capacity as an interexchange
16 carrier?

17 MR. BUZAROTT: There is a service in
18 Verizon's access tariff that provides access to its
19 digital cross-connect systems. I don't know if we
20 use that in our capacity as an IXC.

21 MR. KEHOE: Are you seeking any access to
22 that under this issue?

1 MR. BUZAROTT: Yes, we are.

2 MR. KEHOE: Could you explain what access
3 you're seeking.

4 MR. BUZAROTT: We are seeking access in
5 the manner that's provided to IXC's under Verizon's
6 interstate access tariff through the Intellimux
7 service that's described in that tariff.

8 MR. KEHOE: Verizon, is that your
9 understanding of what they're seeking?

10 MR. GANSERT: Yes, and I think the key
11 point is that it's in TELEMUK's service. It's not
12 access to DCS but access to a service that is far
13 more than the cross-connect system. The
14 cross-connect system happens to be what makes the
15 cross-connect. The service is a management service
16 for channels. It allows customers to order
17 multiple channels and to describe switching
18 arrangements between them, protection arrangements
19 and time of day rearrangement configuration.

20 So, it's not access to a cross-connect
21 system. It's a service that uses a cross-connect
22 system.

1 MS. FARROBA: Bill, did you have any other
2 questions?

3 MR. KEHOE: No, I don't.

4 MR. KOERNER: I'm Brad Koerner. I would
5 like to ask you questions about issue IV-21. I
6 would like to start with the multiplexing. I would
7 like to clarify, Ms. Fox, if you would, Verizon's
8 position on a couple of points in your testimony
9 earlier.

10 Is it Verizon's position that if a
11 competitive LEC ordered a piece of transport, say,
12 at OC3 level, you would do whatever needed to be
13 done to the existing transport in the way of
14 multiplexing or demultiplexing to enable it to act
15 as an OC3 piece of transport?

16 MS. FOX: Yes.

17 MR. KOERNER: Okay. Also in the example
18 that WorldCom's counsel asked you about, four DS1s
19 from a separate central offices coming into a
20 tandem switch, and you indicated, I believe, that
21 you would not provide a multiplexor that would
22 enable those to come out of the tandem switch as a

1 DS3; is that correct?

2 MS. FOX: That's correct.

3 Actually, could we go back to your
4 previous question? The way you phrased it or the
5 words you used when you asked question, would we do
6 anything we needed to do to provide an OC3 for a
7 CLEC, if the CLEC orders an OC3 dedicated transport
8 facility, we check to see if facilities are
9 available. And if the facilities are available and
10 there is spare capacity between the two routes that
11 the CLEC wants to connect, then we would provision
12 the OC3.

13 I didn't want to give you the impression
14 that we were agreeing we would do absolutely
15 anything upon receiving an order, so as to
16 provision an OC3 for a CLEC. I wanted to make this
17 clear.

18 MR. KOERNER: What circumstances would
19 facilities not be available?

20 MS. FOX: There may not be spare capacity
21 between two points in our infrastructure.

22 MR. KOERNER: So you would not install

1 another multiplexer to enable it to perform at OC3?

2 MS. FOX: That's correct.

3 MS. FARROBA: Would you provide it if
4 there was a multiplexor and there was, I guess, a
5 piece of transport, but they weren't currently put
6 together?

7 MS. FOX: I'm not sure I know how to
8 answer your question. If we have spare capacity
9 between two locations and the add/drop multiplexor
10 has an OC3 drop card there or has a capability to
11 receive it because that's the way the bay has been
12 provisioned, that we will provide OC3 in that case.

13 Do you have any additional comments?

14 MR. GANSERT: No. I think that's a fair
15 description. Same way we would provision services
16 for anybody else.

17 MR. KOERNER: And the example, the four
18 DS1s coming out of the tandem as a DS3, would it be
19 possible for a competitive LEC in that situation to
20 order a DS3 piece of transport from that tandem
21 switch?

22 MS. FOX: From a co-location arrangement

1 in that office that contains a tandem switch.

2 MR. KOERNER: That's regardless of whether
3 there were four--even if there were four DS1s
4 coming into that tandem from the four central
5 offices?

6 MS. FOX: The way we sell dedicated
7 transport is that it has to terminate in
8 co-location when it touches a Verizon office. So,
9 today, a CLEC could order four DS1s from those
10 individual end offices, assume there is a CLEC
11 co-location arrangement in each of those four
12 offices, and it could order those DS1s to terminate
13 its co-location arrangement in the office where the
14 tandem is located.

15 And then a CLEC could order DS3 transport
16 from that co-location arrangement where the tandem
17 is onto where it needs to go, assuming its switch
18 location or another Verizon co-location
19 arrangement.

20 MR. KOERNER: Thank you.

21 I would like to turn to diverse facilities
22 now. WorldCom, if you could help me understand if

1 I have your position correct. The first thing you
2 would want, if the facilities were available, is
3 the transport as an unbundled network level.

4 MR. BUZAROTT: That's correct.

5 MR. KOERNER: If that was not available,
6 you would want to--you would want Verizon to
7 provide it through special construction order out
8 of the interstate tariff?

9 MR. BUZAROTT: We would want Verizon to
10 provide it, or we may request Verizon to provide it
11 out of the interstate or intrastate tariff, and
12 that may include special construction provisions of
13 those tariffs.

14 MR. KOERNER: Okay. Is there something
15 else? Another scenario?

16 MR. BUZAROTT: I'm not sure if we just
17 ordered it out of the interstate access tariff, for
18 example, whether we could obtain the facilities we
19 needed or if we would have to go to special
20 construction. Special construction has a very
21 defined meaning in their tariffs.

22 MR. KOERNER: That's different from the

1 special access. Could you briefly explain that
2 difference.

3 MR. BUZAROTT: In the interstate access
4 tariff, there is a special access service that they
5 sell, and they will provision that service under
6 whatever the terms and conditions that are spelled
7 out in that tariff. And there are certain
8 conditions when facilities are not available to
9 obtain service that the customer requires. You
10 have to use the special construction provisions of
11 the tariff. Verizon's case is a separate tariff in
12 the interstate jurisdiction.

13 MR. KOERNER: Is that your understanding
14 also, Verizon?

15 MS. FOX: That would be general--I would
16 agree with the way he characterized special
17 construction in the special access tariff.

18 MR. KOERNER: Okay. Earlier, I believe
19 you indicated that, Verizon, you would provide
20 diverse facilities as unbundled network element if
21 it were available, or you would permit the CLEC to
22 order that element from a special construction out